TEMPEST IN TEAPOT: THE REFORM IN LATIN PRONUNCIATION

A Portion of

A HISTORY OF THE PRONUNCIATION OF LEARNED LATIN LOAN-WORDS AND FOREIGN WORDS IN ENGLISH

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1938

BY

THOMAS PYLES

BALTIMORE

1939

TEMPEST IN TEAPOT: THE REFORM IN LATIN PRONUNCIATION

A Portion of

A HISTORY OF THE PRONUNCIATION OF LEARNED LATIN LOAN-WORDS AND FOREIGN WORDS IN ENGLISH

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1938

BY

THOMAS PYLES

BALTIMORE

1939

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

CONTENTS

PART I. OLD ENGLISH

Introduction
Chapter I: Stress and Quantity
Chapter II: Vowels and Consonants

PART II: MIDDLE ENGLISH

Introduction
Chapter III: Stress and Quantity
Chapter IV: Vowels and Consonants

PART III: MODERN ENGLISH

Introduction
Chapter V: Stress and Quantity
Chapter VI: Vowels and Consonants

PART IV: THE REFORM

Chapter VII: Tempest in Teapot

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41547016_0153

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to trace the history of the pronunciation of learned Latin loan-words and foreign words in English from the beginnings to the present day. The general principles which govern the pronunciation of these words have been formulated.

Old English stressed learned Latin loans precisely according to the native pattern—that is, the stress was almost without exception placed on the first syllable. The characteristics of the school pronunciation in regard to quantity are too complicated for inclusion in this summary: these characteristics are, however, fully described and discussed. The study then proceeds to an examination of the individual vowels and consonants in O. E.

In Middle English the situation in regard to loan-words is considerably complicated by the fact that it is often well-nigh impossible to distinguish between words borrowed direct from Latin and words in learned form which have come into English by way of French. A solution of this vexing problem did not, however, come within the scope of the present work, since it in no way involves the question of pronunciation. The situation is still further complicated by the fact that, from the 14th century on, reformers of spelling endeavored to re-spell loan-words so as to bring them closer to their originals, with the result that many words from French appear in Latin form because of the efforts—often misguided—of scholars. The difficulties are, however, partially compensated for by the fact that no really important changes in the reproduction of the foreign sounds occur until modern times.

Rime is one of the important sources of our knowledge of the pronunciation of Latin loan-words in M. E., the other being spelling. Chaucer and Gower abound in rimes in which a Latin word is bound with an English one, and these show clearly what independently of them we might have suspected on purely historical grounds, namely, that in late M. E. at least, the pronunciation of Latin loan-words and foreign words did not commonly show any differentiation from the pronunciation of native words, and that the pronunciation of this particular

group of borrowings follows more or less closely in regard to certain vowel quantities the development of the English language, a development which in turn regulated in many respects the school pronunciation of Latin.

The most momentous change in the history of the pronunciation of Latin in England was taking place at the beginning of the Modern English period, namely, the vowel-shift which so strikingly differentiates English vowels from those heard on the Continent; its details are, however, well known to scholars, and required no detailed treatment. Not so easy was the task of formulating rules for the stressing of Latin loan-words in Modern English: different grounds can often be given for one and the same method of stressing a word; different factors have often worked in the same direction; the same word is often stressed in two different ways. Careful examination reveals, however, that there is more order than disorder, and the great majority of stressed syllables can fortunately be explained satisfactorily.

A final section gives special attention to the " reformed," or classical, pronunciation of Latin and its effects on the English language.

[Reprinted from *ELH, A Journal of English Literary History,* Vol. 6, No. 2, June, 1939.]

TEMPEST IN TEAPOT: REFORM IN LATIN PRONUNCIATION

By Thomas Pyles

Evidence abounds to show that from the earliest times the English, despite the efforts of foreign teachers, made little effort to conform to any model in the pronunciation of Latin save that of their own language. Indeed, the same conformity to the pattern furnished by the vernacular is to be observed in the pronunciation of Latin by the various continental nations. The great vowel-shift which was well under way at the beginning of the Modern English period has, however, made the English pronunciation of Latin differ more radically from the classical pronunciation than does that of any continental nation. This vowel-shift caused different values to be assigned to the various letters, and these new values were of course carried over into the pronunciation of Latin words. Latin in the mouths of Frenchmen, Germans, Spaniards, and Italians has *approximately* the same vowels, though the Frenchman's are likely to show nasalization; but the Englishman's vowels are so different from these as to be incomprehensible to a foreign Latinist, because the pronunciation of Latin in England has followed closely the development of the English language. No other cause for the English pronunciation of Latin need be sought for. As Henry Bradley says:

> It is sometimes imagined that the modern English way of pronouncing Latin was a deliberate invention of the Protestant reformers. For this view there is no foundation in fact. It may be conceded that English ecclesiastics and scholars who had frequent occasion to converse in Latin with Italians would learn to pronounce it in the Italian way; and no doubt the Reformation must have operated to arrest the growing tendency to the Italianization of English Latin. But there is no evidence that before the Reformation the un-English pronunciation was taught in the schools. The grammar-school pronunciation of the early nineteenth century was the lineal descendant of the grammar-school pronunciation of the fourteenth century.[1]

[1] Introduction to J. Sargeaunt's *Pronunciation of English Words Derived from the Latin,* S. P. E. Tract IV (Oxford, 1920), p. 5.

Though for convenience' sake we speak of *a* continental pronunciation of Latin, there can be no doubt that there are many continental pronunciations, that each nation has made its pronunciation of Latin conform to its own sound-system. For instance, the name *Cicero* is [sisero] to a Frenchman, [tsitsero] to a German, [tʃitʃero] to an Italian. There is, indeed, considerable diversity in continental practice, even in liturgical use. Priests are quite likely to pronounce Latin exactly like their own vernacular. F. Brittain reports that

> a French priest reciting the *Gloria Patri* . . . will say: *Sicüt erat in prẽsipio*; a Spanish priest will announce the Gospel as *Inithium sancti ebanhelii*; a German priest will end the Lord's prayer with *in zaecula zaeculorum*; and a Portuguese cantor will sing *Adeshtə, fidele*sh,

and that a Roman Catholic of his acquaintance " laments that, whenever he has heard a Frenchman giving a mere Latin quotation, he has never understood a word of it, owing to the absence of stress-accent and the disfigurement of the Latin by the French phrase-accent." [2] Erasmus, in his *De Recta Latini Graecique Sermonis Pronuntiatione* (Basiliae, 1528) deplores the complete absence of any international pronunciation of Latin, with consequent confusion: " one would have thought all Babel had come together." A large part of this confusion he attributes to the practice of various nations of pronouncing Latin in their own way, and proceeds to give examples of contemporary pronunciations of Latin, many chosen, as we should expect, from Dutch usage. It is not surprising that the national pronunciations have without exception the same phonetic peculiarities as the vernacular: the French, Erasmus informs us, pronounce Latin *u* in their own way, and prefix *e* to words beginning with *st* and *sp*; the Germans confuse *b* and *p*, saying *pipere* for *bibere* and *biper* for *piper*; some of the Spaniards, like the French, prefix *e* to initial *sp* and *st*, and confuse *b* and *v*, saying *bibit* for *vivit*.[3] He concludes that it would be best to return to the pronunciation of classical times, his conclusions agreeing to a surprising extent with those of modern scholarship.

[2] *Latin in Church* (Cambridge, 1934), pp. 28-9.

[3] Erasmus is of course referring to the Spanish fricative [ƀ]. Spain has been called " Felix natio, ubi vivere est bibere."

It is obvious from what Erasmus says that there was no standardised pronunciation for ecclesiastical or diplomatic purposes; but it must be equally obvious that most English speakers of Latin were perfectly aware of the fact that they were giving to their vowels qualities which they did not elsewhere have. There must also have been many who could change over to a vowel system resembling the continental (we may use the singular here for the sake of convenience, though bearing in mind that no two languages have vowel systems precisely alike) with little more difficulty than is experienced to-day by an Englishman in using the " reformed " pronunciation of Latin. This fact probably explains the famous story of the conversation in Latin between Queen Elizabeth and the Polish ambassador. I do not think that, in view of what Erasmus tells us of Latin pronunciation in the reign of Henry VIII, we are justified in assuming that Elizabeth habitually used any pronunciation of Latin other than the traditional English one, though she undoubtedly knew the non-English vowel qualities. Likewise, when the Duke of Stettin-Pomerania visited England in 1602, and his party lost their way, they were directed in Latin by an English gentleman, according to the diary of Frederic Gerschow, a scholar who accompanied the Duke and who recorded the incident. Later, on reaching their destination, they got what they wanted through the intermediary of a learned parson. Joan Parkes, who recounts the incident,[4] thinks that the fact that the Duke could understand the Latin of the gentleman and the parson indicates that the vowels had not yet changed so as to be radically different from continental vowels. But, as Zachrisson has shown, the vowels changed much earlier than has been thought, and G. C. Moore Smith is undoubtedly correct in his explanation that the learned parson may have accommodated his pronunciation a little to the needs of the foreigner.[5]

Only a short time after the publication of Erasmus' book, John Cheke (1514-1557) and Thomas Smith (1513-1577), two young Cambridge students who were later to become the great classical scholars of the time in England, attempted to reform

[4] " English Vowel-Sounds in Latin," *Notes and Queries*, Feb. 27, 1932, p. 152.
[5] *Notes and Queries*, Mar. 19, 1932, p. 212.

the pronunciation of Greek,[6] which apparently was given the contemporary Greek pronunciation, i. e., with ι, η, υ, ει, οι, υι all sounded as [i]. Smith and Cheke " well perceived how the vulgar sounding of the Greek was, and concluded it evidently false, that so many different letters and diphthongs should have but one and the same sound." [7] Their scheme was to do away with giving " one and the same sound " to so many letters by substituting English vowels; but there can be little doubt that the usual English pronunciation of Greek before the reform of Cheke and Smith, though under the influence of the contemporary Greek pronunciation of classical Greek, was distinctly national.

As to the pronunciation of Latin there can be no doubt. Lipsius tells us in 1586 that the English pronounce *regina, amicus, vita* as *regeina, ameicus, veita,* i. e., they substituted the contemporary English value of the letter *i* for the Continental value [i] with which Lipsius was most familiar.[8]

Thomas Coryat, the traveler, furnishes us with another early record of the difference between English and continental Latin, when he tells us why he decided to use the Italian pronunciation:

> The Italian when he uttereth any Latin word wherein this letter i is to be pronounced long, doth always pronounce it as a double e, viz. as ee. As for example: he pronounceth feedes for fides: veeta for vita: ameecus for amicus, &c. but where the i is not to be pronounced long he uttereth it as we doe in England, as in the words, impius, aquila, patria, Ecclesia: not aqueela, patreea, Eccleseea. And this pronunciation is so general in all Italy, that every man which speaketh Latin soundeth a double e for an i. Neither is it proper to Italy only, but to all other nations whatsoever in Christendome saving to England. For whereas in my travels I discoursed in Latin with Frenchmen, Germans, Spaniards, Danes, Polonians, Suecians, and divers others, I observed that every one with whom I had any conference, pronounced the i after the same manner that the Italians use. Neither would some of them (amongst whom I was not a little inquisitive for the reason of this their pronunciation) sticke to affirm that Plautus, Terence, Cicero, Hortensius, Caesar,

---

[6] Their views are set forth in Cheke's *De Pronuntiatione Graecae Potissimum Linguae* (Basiliae, 1555) and Smith's *De Recta et Emendata Linguae Graecae Pronuntiatione* (Paris, 1568).

[7] John Strype, *Life of Sir Thomas Smith* (Oxford, 1820), p. 8.

[8] *De Recta Pronuntiatione Latinae Linguae Dialogus* (Antwerp, 1628), p. 23.

and those other selected flowers of eloquence amongst the auncient Romans, pronounced the i in that sort as they themselves doe. Whereupon having observed such a generall consent amongst them in the pronunciation of this letter, I have thought good to imitate these nations herein, and to abandon my old English pronunciation of *vita, fides,* and *amicus,* as being utterly dissonant from the sound of all other Nations; and have determined (God willing) to retayne the same till my dying day.[9]

Shakespeare's *Merry Wives of Windsor,* written around the turn of the century, gives us a good idea of the English pronunciation of Latin—as well as the Welsh mispronunciation. Sir Hugh Evans, the Welsh parson, is displaying young William Page's progress in Latin to Mistress Page:

EVANS. What is " fair," William?
WILL. *Pulcher.*
MISTRESS QUICKLY. Polecats! There are fairer things than polecats, sure.
EVANS. . . . What is he, William, that does lend articles?
WILL. Articles are borrowed of the pronoun, and be thus declined, *Singulariter, nominativo, hic, haec, hoc.*
EVANS. *Nominativo, hig, hag, hog.* . . . Well, what is your accusative case?
WILL. *Accusativo, hinc.*
EVANS. I pray you, have your remembrance, child. *Accusativo, hing, hang, hog.*
QUICK. " Hang-hog " is Latin for bacon, I warrant you.
EVANS. Leave your prabbles, 'oman. What is the focative case, William?
WILL. O,—*vocativo, O.*
EVANS. Remember, William; focative is *caret.*
QUICK. And that's a good root.
EVANS. . . . What is your genitive case plural, William?
WILL. . . . Genitive, *horum, harum, horum.*
QUICK. Vengeance of Jenny's case! Fie on her! Never name her, child, if she be a whore.
EVANS. For shame, 'oman.
QUICK. You do ill to teach the child such words. He teaches him to hick and hack, which they'll do fast enough of themselves, and to call " horum,"—fie upon you![10]

Drummond of Hawthornden reports Ben Jonson as telling him that " Scaliger writtes ane epistle to Casaubone, wher he scorns his [Casaubon's? But he was a Frenchman who lived in

[9] *Coryat's Crudities,* Reprint of original ed. of 1611 (Glasgow, 1905). 2. 59-60.
[10] 4. 1.

London from 1610-1614. The editor suggests "us"] Englishe speaking of Latine, for he thought he had spoken English to him." [11]

Somewhat later, Samuel Sorbière, a French traveler to England, gives us additional testimony as to the strangeness of the English pronunciation of Latin: "Les Anglais s'expliquent en latin d'un certain accent, et avec une prononciation qui ne le rend pas moins difficile que leur langue." [12]

It is not surprising that Milton, with his predilection for Italy, should have preferred the Italian pronunciation to the English. He expresses himself very clearly on the subject in his *Tractate on Education,* in which he advises teachers of Latin to encourage "a distinct and clear pronunciation, as near as may be to the Italian, especially in the vowels," proceeding, "for we Englishmen, being far northerly, do not open our mouths in the cold air wide enough to grace a southern tongue; but are observed by all other nations to speak exceeding close and inward; so that to smatter Latin with an English mouth is as ill a hearing as Law French." [13] Thomas Ellwood, the Quaker, was employed at one time to read to Milton. He tells us:

At my first sitting to read to him, observing that I used the English pronunciation, he told me, if I would have the benefit of the Latin tongue, not only to read and understand Latin authors, but to converse with foreigners, either abroad or at home, I must learn the foreign pronunciation. To this I consenting, he instructed me how to sound the vowels; so different from the common pronunciation used by the English, who speak Anglice their Latin, that—with some other variations in sounding some consonants in particular cases, as *c* before *e* and *i* like *ch, sc* before *i* like *sh,* &c.—the Latin

---

[11] *Ben Jonson's Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden,* Shakespeare Society (London, 1842), p. 33. An editorial note says, "This seems to allude to a curious passage in a letter of Scaliger, addressed, not to Casaubon, but to Stephanus Ubertus, in 1608." F. Brittain, *Latin in Church,* p. 35, tells that Scaliger was visited by some unknown Englishman in Leyden in 1608, and after listening to a long discourse in Latin from his visitor, which he did not even recognize as Latin, expressed his regret that he did not understand English very well.

[12] *Voyage en Angleterre* (Paris, 1664). The passage is quoted in G. B. Hill's edition of Samuel Johnson's *Lives of the Poets* (Oxford, 1905). 1. 133. Cf. also H. Neville, *Plato Redivivus* (London, 1681), p. 12, in which another continental European, this time an Italian, speaks of the English pronunciation of Latin.

[13] *Prose Works,* ed. C. Symmons (London, 1806). 1. 277-8.

thus spoken seemed as different from that which was delivered, as the English generally speak it, as if it were another language.[14]

However, Milton had finally to give in, in this as well as in other more important matters, for, writing in 1661, he says in his *Grammar* that "Few will be persuaded to pronounce Latin otherwise than their own English."[15]

Samuel Pepys tells amusingly of the discomfiture of an "Oxford scholar in a Doctor of Law's gowne" who, at a dinner at the Spanish Ambassador's, "though a gentle sort of scholar, yet sat like a fool for want of French or Spanish, but knew only Latin, which he spoke like an Englishman."[16]

Pepys's contemporary, John Evelyn, hearing the exercises at Westminster School, condemned "their odd pronouncing of Latin, so that out of England none were able to understand it, or endure it."[17] One suspects that Evelyn here is making a show of his cosmopolitanism. That a continental pronunciation of Latin may have had some currency in England in the seventeenth century, though not in the schools, is faintly implied by this remark and perhaps by Pepys's. The only two rimes I have come upon in English poems which indicate any other pronunciation of Latin than the English come from this period: one is from Sir John Denham's "A Dialogue between Sir John Pooley and Mr. Thomas Killigrew" and is as follows:

> And I will rub my Mater pia
> To find a Rhyme to Gonorrheia,
> And put it in my Letania.

This is suspect: the lines themselves indicate that the rime may be a bad one. The other rime is from "Satyr Unmuzzled," published in *State-Poems Continued* (London, 1702), a collection of salacious and political poetry from the period of the Restoration: *Thomas* and *Mandamus* are in rime (p. 63). In the light of all the other evidence, I do not think that the use of a continental pronunciation in England could have been anything more than a rapidly passing vogue confined to a very small circle of English cosmopolites. Lord Rochester, who

[14] *The History of Thomas Ellwood Written by Himself*, Morley's Universal Library, No. 32 (London, 1885), pp. 134-5.

[15] *Prose Wks.* 3. 441.

[16] *Diary*, May 5, 1669.

[17] *Diary*, ed. W. Bray (London, 1872). 1. 372.

should belong to such a group, always indicates the English pronunciation by his rimes of Latin words with English. Samuel Butler's *Hudibras* contains the following rimes, chosen almost at random: *satis*-hate us, *juvare*-miscarry, twice I-*vici*, *phenomenas*-case.

Milton's demand that Ellwood learn the Italian pronunciation roused all the sturdy insularity of Dr. Samuel Johnson, who writes of it in his *Life of Milton:*

> This seems to have been a task troublesome without use. There is little reason for preferring the Italian pronunciation to our own, except that it is more general: and to teach it to an Englishman is only to make him a foreigner at home. He who travels, if he speaks Latin, may so soon learn the sounds which every native gives it, that he need make no provision before his journey; and if strangers visit us, it is their business to practise such conformity to our modes as they expect of us in their own countries.[18]

Furthermore, the Doctor stuck to his guns: though he undoubtedly could use a continental pronunciation, he would not do so in London, for Boswell tells us that " when Sir Joshua Reynolds, at one of the dinners of the Royal Academy, presented him to a Frenchman of great distinction, he would not deign to speak French, but talked Latin though his Excellency did not understand it, owing, perhaps, to Johnson's English pronunciation." [19] He was of the opinion, however, that the Italian pronunciation was historically more "correct," for Cooper reports a conversation with him in which he said:

> It is probable that the immediate descendants of the Romans would be more likely to pronounce the Roman language with propriety, than foreign nations. It is probable that persons living in the same climate, and on the same spot, would be more apt to fall into the pronunciation which a Roman would adopt, than any foreigner: for the natural causes that affect pronunciation, would be common to the ancient and the modern inhabitant of the place. For these reasons I incline to think that the Italians have the chance of being more correct than any other nation.[20]

Then, to illustrate, he quoted a passage of Virgil (obviously

[18] *Lives of the English Poets,* ed. G. B. Hill (Oxford, 1905). 1. 133.

[19] *Boswell's Life of Johnson,* ed. G. B. Hill (Oxford, 1887). 2. 404.

[20] In Joseph Priestley, *Theological and Miscellaneous Works,* ed. J. T. Rutt (Hackney, 1817-32). 23. 233, note.

with the Italian pronunciation), saying, "Pronounce this passage like an Englishman, and the beauty almost vanishes: pronounce it like an Italian, and it must be felt."

Among dissenting voices of the eighteenth century must be mentioned Jenkin Thomas Philipps, translator and linguist, who has a great deal to say of the faulty way in which the English pronounce Latin in his *Compendious Way of Teaching Antient and Modern Languages* (London, 1750). William Mitford, in his *Essay upon the Harmony of Language* (London, 1774), realises the inadequacy of the English pronunciation (p. 224 ff.), but, since "to imagine it possible to recover within many degrees the true pronunciation of the Greek and Latin languages were preposterous" (p. 213), feels that "what we should endeavour to acquire is not the particular sound of the letters, so much as the general harmony of the language" (p. 228); however, "the difficulty, or rather the awkwardness of altering our usual pronunciation of the Latin vowels, so as to give the proper quantities to all syllables, were perhaps most easily overcome by adopting the Italian sound of all the vowels" (p. 229).

To list rimes from the poets showing the English pronunciation of Latin would be an almost endless task; furthermore, it would only serve to support what we already know. The poems of Swift and Byron, to mention only two outstanding figures, abound in such rimes: Swift has, e. g., fallow-*Gallo, praeditum*-credit 'em, abomine 'em-*ad hominem, ecclesiae*-please ye, penn'd 'em-*commendam*, bite 'em-*infinitum*, undermine 'em-*jus divinum*, vary-*episcopari*, jaws, trow-*plaustro, imprimis*-rhyme is; Byron has *niger*-oblige 'er-*bos piger, Davus sum*-hum-dumb, *nil admirari*-vary-wary, *quarum*-harem-spare 'em, *vulgarit*-share it, *mores*-stories, *negotiis-sociis*-ferocious, *male*-gayly-daily, way-*sine qua*, quibble, he-*impossibile, desideratum-substratum*-relate 'em, great as-*Cincinnatus*-potatoes, question-*Hephaestion*-digestion, *belli*-well I-fell I, can be-*de se*.[21]

Despite occasional signs of preference, in England and elsewhere, for an Italian pronunciation of Latin as being historically more "pure" than any other—an utterly mistaken notion advanced even by that superb pillar of common sense, Dr.

[21] See also G. C. Moore Smith, "The English Language and the 'Restored' Pronunciation of Latin," *Jespersen Miscellany* (Copenhagen, 1930), pp. 171-3.

Johnson—there are few evidences of real discontent with the "old" pronunciation, which seems to have served well enough for all practical purposes, until the nineteenth century, which brought with it the rise of linguistic scholarship.

As early as 1846, Charles Kraitsir, M. D., advocated what he believed the Roman pronunciation of Latin in his *Significance of the Alphabet* (Boston), and Mrs. M. L. Putnam, writing in the *North American Review* in 1849,[22] gives the full sanction of her authority to Kraitsir's book, at the same time expressing in no uncertain terms her dissatisfaction with, and her disgust for, the traditional English pronunciation. This learned lady well merits quotation on the subject, not only of Latin pronunciation, but also of refinement and propriety of diction in English. Because of the English method of pronouncing Latin, she writes,

> many coarse and unpleasant sounds are conveyed into the Latin which are wholly foreign to it, and which are plainly corruptions in our own language. Of these is the sound given to s and t before i followed by a vowel. This harsh sound—so displeasing to a refined ear, that, even in English, every elegant speaker is careful to avoid it, where this can be done without the appearance of affectation,—is strenuously insisted upon, and its use amply illustrated by examples. We even go beyond the English in this respect; for whereas they exempt from change the t preceded by s, our grammarians instruct us to pronounce *Sallustius, Salluscheus; mixtio, mixcheo,* etc. Even these preliminary rules are not deemed sufficient; but, since the unwarped mind of a child is continually liable to err into the right, his memory is continually refreshed by foot notes, which instruct him that *ar-ti-um* is *arsheum,* and that the comparative of *mit-is* is not *mit-i-or,* as he might reasonably suppose, but *misheor* (pp. 441-2).

Reform was definitely in the air, whether needed or not,[23]

[22] 68. 436-65.

[23] There was more need for it in America than in England, and the reformed pronunciation made its way here more rapidly than in England largely because of the lack of a standard system here. New England long continued in the English tradition; but in the Middle States the Dutch and the Germans introduced their own methods. See W. M. Nevin, *Mercersburg Review* 4 (1852). 187-8: "As one of the fundamental maxims it was laid down to us, in the Grammar of Dr. Ross, which we learned by heart, that an Anglicized pronunciation of Latin must be cautiously avoided"; instead, the Pennsylvania schoolboys strove for a "sublime, sonorous pronunciation of the vowels *a* and *e*." In the South and West, French pronunciation was quite frequently heard. To these must be added the Italianized

and the years 1850-80 saw the publication of the results of research into Latin pronunciation carried on in Germany, America, and England. In 1851, Samuel Steman Haldeman, zoölogist, geologist, chemist, naturalist, spelling reformer, college professor, operator of a sawmill, and prominent Catholic convert (*DAB*), published his *Elements of Latin Pronunciation, for the Use of Students* (Philadelphia), in which he advocated a reformed pronunciation based upon his researches into the ancient Roman pronunciation. Much more important is W. P. Corssen's *Über Aussprache, Vokalismus und Betonung der lateinischen Sprache* (Leipzig, 1858-9), embodying scholarship of a high order: it is with Corssen that the student of Latin pronunciation must start, for all subsequent investigations of the classical pronunciation must be based to a large extent on his work. J. F. Richardson, in his *Roman Orthoëpy: a Plea for the Restoration of the True System of Latin Pronunciation* (New York, 1859), was one of the first American scholars to adopt the reformed methods of pronunciation, though some of his views are not accepted by more recent scholarship. According to J. E. Sandys, "it was mainly owing to a pamphlet issued in 1871 by Professor G. M. Lane, of Harvard, that a reformed pronunciation of Latin was adopted in all the colleges and schools of the United States."[24] Mention should also be made of the Tafels' (Dr. Leonard and Professor Rudolph) *Latin Pronunciation and the Latin Alphabet* (Philadelphia, 1860), G. K. Bartholomew's *Grammar of the Latin Language* (Cincinnati, 1873), and Walter Blair's *Latin Pronunciation, an Inquiry into the Proper Sounds of the Latin Language during the Classical Period* (New York and Chicago, 1873). By the time of the publication of Blair's book, Professor Haldeman was able to state that "after a struggle of twenty years, the claims of genuine Latin and

Latin of the Catholic clergy taught in parochial schools and Catholic colleges, all together forming, according to Harry Thurston Peck, *Latin Pronunciation* (New York, 1894), "a picturesque confusion such as no European country ever knew" (p. 6).

[24] "Classics," *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (11th ed.) 6.461. The statement is not strictly true, as we shall see later. W. A. Ellis tells that in the Chicago high school which he attended in 1878 the English pronunciation was in almost universal use, though "in Greek we gave the continental sounds to the vowels" ("Those Good Old Days," *Classical Journal* 27. 484-96).

Greek pronunciation have been admitted on both sides of the Atlantic, by an almost simultaneous movement, although some of the American colleges had adopted the ancient method at an earlier date." [25] Nevertheless, statistics gathered by the Bureau of Education at Washington show that in 1876 out of 237 colleges consulted, 90 used the English, 75 the continental, 72 the reformed method. Says A. G. Hopkins:

> They [these figures] seem to show . . . that there is no great clamor in America for the Roman pronunciation. . . . Public opinion seems to be far from satisfied in regard to it, and the great majority of our schools and colleges do not adopt it. Harvard and Princeton use it: on the other hand Dartmouth, Williams, Amherst, and multitudes of others do not. These statistics still further show that this attempt at reform has simply introduced a disturbing and distracting force into our education. Instead of having the English and the Continental,—two systems tolerably congenial,—we now have a third, which lays hold of many our our preparatory schools, and which introduces only confusion into our colleges. We shall not for many years recover from the demoralization which has been occasioned by this attempt to foist upon us an uncongenial and an ill-matured system of Latin pronunciation.[26]

Meanwhile, in England, Professors Munro and Palmer published their *Syllabus of Latin Pronunciation* (Cambridge and Oxford) in 1871, and the same year saw the publication of H. J. Roby's *Grammar of the Latin Language*, of which at least 150 pages are devoted to phonology. Benjamin Hall Kennedy likewise devoted at least 68 pages of his *Public School Latin Grammar* (London, 1871) to phonology and its applications. According to J. E. Sandys,[27] the reformed pronunciation was adopted at University College, London, and at Shrewsbury, Marlborough, Liverpool College, Christ's Hospital, Dulwich, and the City of London School. In 1874 A. J. Ellis published his *Practical Hints on the Quantitative Pronunciation of Latin* (London), expounding a system so complex that it is doubtful whether even Macaulay's schoolboy could have followed it.[28]

[25] Review of Blair's *Lat. Pron.* in *Southern Magazine* 6 (1873). 626.

[26] "The Reform in Pronouncing Latin," *International Review* 11 (1881). 73-4.

[27] *Loc. cit.*, p. 457.

[28] It should be mentioned in passing that some years previous to the introduction of the reform with which we are concerned, certain schoolmasters had begun to insist upon observance of the classical quantities. In his *Two Trifles* (London, 1895), Fitzedward Hall tells of being taken to task by his teacher for saying

What was the reception recorded this first generation of reformers? Fired with missionary zeal, they seem to have overstepped themselves, making such difficult distinctions as A. J. Ellis makes when he says

> the names of Roman writers which are anglicised, as Virgil, Horace, Ovid, receive their English sounds, and in accordance with them, we must when speaking English talk of Cicero as *Sis'ser-oh,* and Caesar as *Seize-her,* &c. just as we necessarily use Rome, Naples, Venice, and Florence as English words. . . . It is only in recently introduced names of foreign countries, towns, and people, that those who know the languages venture to introduce the native pronunciation in English sentences. We must adopt the same course with regard to Latin names and Latin words and phrases introduced into English sentences, as we now adopt for French.[29]

Who is qualified offhand to make such a distinction? Would one make it, say, between *Caesar* and *Scaliger, sine qua non* and *fieri facias*? Professor Lemuel S. Potwin, of Western Reserve College, was not so moderate as Ellis. He was for going the limit, even in the pronunciation of familiar names like *Cicero,* apparently out of respect for the feelings of their bearers, for he writes, "If there is any reader of this Article by the name of Cook, let him imagine himself addressed for a few days by everybody as *Soos,* and he can tell how Cicero would have felt."[30]

Furthermore, respect for the method was not likely to be engendered by continual references to the "English barbaric pronunciation" and by violent disagreement and uncertainty among the reformers themselves. A. J. Ellis, for instance, admits that the "restored" pronunciation is a makeshift, but "these rough approximations will probably suffice for all school purposes" (*Quant. Pron.,* p. 8). He is in disagreement with

dóctrĭnal instead of *doctrĭnal.* Quick as a flash, this remarkable lad responded: "If others, in their solicitude to *propăgate* refinement, choose to be *irrĭtated* or *excĭted,* because of what they take to be my *genuĭne ignórance* in *oratóry,* they should at least be sure that their discomposure is not *gratuĭtous.*" (I have, for the sake of uniformity, not used Hall's method of indicating stress in this passage.) Cf. also the fury of Dr. Skinner in Samuel Butler's *Way of All Flesh* (1903), because Ernest pronounced *Thalia* with a short *i.* "And this to me," he thundered, "who never made a false quantity in my life" (Chap. 30).

[29] *Quantitative Pronunciation,* pp. 2-3, note.

[30] "Shall We Adhere to the English Method of Pronouncing Latin?" *New Englander* 37 (1878). 822.

many of the reformers when he says, " The diphthongal forms *æ, œ*, I shall render by a broader *e*, like the German ä in spräche " (p. 5). In his proposed system, he allows *t* and *d* their English sounds, though " it scarcely admits of doubt that these were as unknown to the Latins, as they are now to most Europeans. But these sounds are most easy to English organs " (p. 7). On the other hand, English organs are disregarded in the pronunciation of consonantal *u*, to be " produced by sounding *v* without allowing the lower lip to touch the upper teeth " (p. 5). And after English organs have shaped themselves to sound *v* in this troublesome fashion, Ellis informs their owners that " it is not to be concluded that I consider these sounds to be perfectly correct or even justifiable by any authorities which can be cited " (p. 7).[31] Such indecision, even if justified, does not inspire confidence.

Then there were the proposed new sounds themselves. Englishmen (and Americans) could be expected to boggle at some of them, and boggle they did, particularly at the pronunciation of *c, g* before *e, i* as [k], [g] and at *v* as [w]. Professor Max Müller[32] attempted to come to the rescue with a rationalisation, and argued that a " modified pronunciation " of *c* before *e* and *i* was " not incompatible with the evidence derived from Latin words transcribed by the Greeks, or Greek words transcribed by the Romans." He points out that " in trying to introduce a more correct pronunciation of Latin, the great stumbling block has always been the hard pronunciation of *c* before *e, i, y, ae, eu, oe*," that " ' Are we to pronounce *Kikero, et ketera, skiskere*? ' has generally been considered, if not a convincing, at all events a most telling, argument against phonetic reformers." Even scholars who are fully convinced of the " hard " sound have seldom ventured to adopt it, " whether from fear of ridicule or from a dislike of the harsh and disagreeable sound." He states that " I have never heard *c* pronounced as *k* before *e* and *i* in any school or university of

[31] Cf. J. F. Roxburgh, a proponent of the reformed pronunciation, who as recently as 1927 writes of it: " If we obeyed all these rules literally, schoolmastering would be a gay profession. There would not be a dull moment in a Lower School Form while the correct pronunciation of *zephyrus* or *occurrerat* was being taught. However, most schools are content with P for PH, and do not rise either to the French U or to the Italian double consonants " (*Spectator* 138. 795).

[32] " On the Pronunciation of *C*," *Academy* 2 (1871). 145-6.

Germany or France, though I believe there is hardly a scholar who has not declared his decided opinion that this is the right pronunciation." In a later article,[33] Max Müller writes that he himself is in favor of *k* for *c* before front vowels (though holding out for a dento-labial *v*), and that he had merely wished, in justifying a "modified pronunciation" of *c* before front vowels, to remove a stumbling-block, declaring himself content to "leave the decision with those to whose judgment in this matter I shall most willingly bow, to Professor Munro of Cambridge and Professor E. Palmer of Oxford," who had been invited by the schoolmasters of England to issue a scheme of Latin pronunciation which would ensure uniformity in any changes contemplated.

The Syllabus drawn up by Munro and Palmer was, according to Robinson Ellis, who reviews the situation up to 1874,

> at once introduced into several of the larger schools in England, at least in the higher forms. I myself adopted it for the use of my classes in University College [London], and a very similar scheme of pronunciation was only last year printed by Professor Key for University College School. Independently of this, a reformed pronunciation has been adopted in various educational establishments in this country; and it is no uncommon occurrence in my classes to find students on their arrival already trained in the new method, with such slight differences (and they are really slight) as the divergence of opinion on particular points makes unavoidable.[34]

The experiment can, however,

> hardly be said as yet to have been adequately tried in schools, or properly seconded in the Universities. At Oxford, when I examined viva voce as Classical Moderator in 1872, I was the only examiner who used the reformed pronunciation, and those who came before me for examination did not generally seem familiar with it. Even now the old use predominates, and it is to be feared that even those trained by the Syllabus at school, *e. g.*, at Shrewsbury, Marlborough, Liverpool College, Christ's Hospital, Dulwich College and the City of London School, are induced to give it up, or at least to suppress it, when they proceed to the Universities (*Ibid.*, p. 399).

Moreover, he feels that, if it is to be successful, the reformed pronunciation alone should be taught, instead of allowing the

[33] "On the Pronunciation of Latin," *Academy* 2 (1871). 565-8.

[34] Report on Latin Philology, *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1873-4, p. 398.

old pronunciation to linger on side by side with the new. However, the " lamentable fluctuation of opinion exhibited by the schoolmasters in their conference this year is a clear proof, if any proof were wanted, of the difficulties which invariably attend any real reform " (p. 399). Fourteen years later, as we shall see, this same Professor Robinson Ellis was to champ at the bit over the absence of " lamentable fluctuation " in the manifesto of the Cambridge Philological Society issued in 1887.[35]

By 1880, despite the efforts of the reformers, comparatively little progress had been made. D. B. King reports that " interest in the new method seems to be dying out in England, the head masters having in many cases gone back to the old method, and no serious attempt having been made to introduce the new pronunciation into Cambridge," adding that " in this country [America] its introduction has been much more general." [36] A. G. Hopkins reports that " in England, which is the home of the movement, the reform is but half-hearted and partial," and quotes the Head Master of Rugby as writing, " I think reformed Latin pronunciation a mere waste of time." [37] Professor Palmer of Oxford—himself one of the authors of the Syllabus—said of it, " I am not aware that individual professors, tutors, or lecturers venture upon it in dealing with their classes, nor have I heard that Cambridge has been more enterprising," adding, " I regard the syllabus as having fallen stillborn." [38] Professor T. A. Thatcher quotes " a fellow of one of the colleges of Oxford " to the effect that " zeal for the new pronunciation has sadly cooled "; that " it has been given up

[35] One feels from the tone of his remarks that the school spirit of an old Oxonian has been aroused at the effrontery of the " Cambridge triumvirate " (J. Peile, J. P. Postgate, J. S. Reid) in presuming to prescribe for Oxford men, rather than his scholarly acumen, when he says: " I had hoped that some other voice than mine would have given expression to the dissatisfied feeling which the recent manifesto of the Cambridge triumvirate . . . cannot fail to produce among Oxford men. . . . It is an outrage to research and to criticism alike to be told dogmatically that *u* as a consonant was always *w*. . . . Let us by all means aim to formulate our doctrine of immaculate pronunciation—I, for one, have, since 1873, invariably used the syllabus then drawn up, not without occasional protests from my friends—but let us take all possible care that our doctrine is a real expression of catholic feeling on the subject" (*Academy* 29. 205). It is difficult to see what catholicity of opinion has to do with the matter.

[36] *Latin Pronunciation* (Boston, 1895), p. 8. Written 1880.

[37] *International Review* 11 (1881). 73. [38] Quoted *ibid.*, p. 73.

again in most schools, and may in fact be said to be extinct.[39] The plight of the scientific linguist is expressed by A. H. Sayce:

> At present it is impossible for the comparative philologist in England to lecture upon Latin without the aid of blackboard and chalk. When he speaks of *i* in Sanskrit or other tongues, the ordinary student thinks of *e* (as in English); when he refers to *e* and *ai* the audience writes downs *a* and *i*; and so long as *agis* and *cecidi* are pronounced *ejis* and *sesīdai*, it is impossible to show that they have any connection with *ago* and *cadere*.[40]

Meanwhile, on this side of the Atlantic, the reformed pronunciation, though received somewhat more generally than in England, was coming in for a goodly share of lambasting. T. A. Thatcher, a professor at Yale, was one of its staunchest opponents. In an article in the *New Englander*,[41] he makes much of our ignorance of the true Roman pronunciation (a favorite argument of the conservatives), expresses alarm over what may happen to proper names and Latin phrases in the event that Corssen's and Richardson's "theories" are put into general practice, but is consoled by the fact that "these reforms have not thus far commended themselves to general acceptance."[42] Eleven years later, N. W. Benedict, Principal of the Rochester Free Academy, takes a cautious view, feels that a "concord of utterance, a harmony of diction," though highly desirable, is impossible of achievement.[43] In 1878 E. H. Twining alludes to a brochure of thirty pages by Professor M. M. Fisher appearing early in April of that year, in which Professor Fisher gives his views upon the pronunciation of Latin, in the form of an attack upon the Roman system and a defence of the English method. Twining's article attempts to answer Fisher's strictures, and is vigorously in favor of the reformed system.[44]

[39] *New Englander* 37 (1878). 827-8.

[40] *Introduction to the Science of Language* (London, 1880). 2. 342-3.

[41] 19 (1861). 102-25.

[42] In 1878 Professor Thatcher had not shifted his position an inch. Despite the obvious fact that the traditional pronunciation had been supplanted almost everywhere in America by that time by the reformed method, he still thought the reform a failure. See his article in the *New Englander* 37. 827-34.

[43] Eighty-fifth Annual Report of the Regents of the University [of the State of New York], (Albany, 1872), pp. 485-96.

[44] *Western* 4. 413-26.

One of the most amusing blasts against the new-fangled pronunciation appeared in 1879 in the *American Church Review* (31. 102-18) under the title "The 'Roman Method' of Pronouncing Latin a Mischievous Mistake." The author, N. E. Cornwall, simply cannot swallow the [k] for *c* and [g] for *g* before front vowels; but even more loathsome, in his opinion, is [w] for *v*. He writes, and one can almost see his lip curling with scorn as he does so:

What an exhibition American boys would make of themselves, repeating the Latin words *vivo, vivis, vivit, vivimus, vivitis, vivunt* with this pronunciation, *wee-wo, wee-wees, wee-weet, wee-wee-moos, wee-wee-tees, wee-woont.* . . . Many boys and girls, as well as men and women, in America, have great power of endurance. But any *lingo* so barbarous would soon prove intolerable to all. . . . And it is a happy circumstance for the cause of high rhetoric, that one of its finest specimens, in the famous dispatch of that great general and orator, Julius Caesar, "*veni, vidi, vici,*" was committed to written characters, and not handed down orally, in such childish utterances as these: *way-nee, wee-dee, wee-kee.* . . . It is to be hoped that such a barbarous pronunciation, whatever it may be called, will be henceforth regarded, not only by thorough scholars, but also by young students, at least in England and America, as a thoroughly punctured and exploded bubble. For it is, at the best, an empty and puerile conceit, especially adapted, and apparently, in part, designed, for the amusement of young students, in all nations, except, possibly, Germans. To thorough scholars whose knowledge of Latin is verified and established by the constant perusal of ancient writings of every period, and to diligent students of those languages which are most directly descended from the Latin, that whimsical conceit is sheer nonsense (pp. 116-7).[45]

Evidently the American character has undergone a process of

[45] See also "Sauce for the Latin Goose and English Gander," *Atlantic Monthly* 61 (1888). 281-2, in which an old-fashioned man complains: "When my latest born comes home from school, and quotes an ancient warrior (whom he indicates as Yulius Keyser) to the effect that 'Wayny, Weedy, Weeky,' I try to persuade myself that my ear rather than his tongue is at fault, as regards an apparent loss of virility in the once familiar utterance." A somewhat different view is held by Walter Sellar and Robert J. Yeatman in their humorous history, *1066 and All That* (New York, 1931). They explain: "Julius Caesar . . . set the memorable Latin sentence, 'Veni, Vidi, Vici,' which the Romans, who were all very well educated, construed correctly. The Britons, however, who of course still used the old pronunciation, understanding him to have called them 'Weeny, Weedy and Weaky,' lost heart and gave up the struggle, thinking that he had already divided them All into Three Parts" (p. 2).

steady deterioration since Mr. Cornwall's day, for American schoolboys do meekly say " wee-wees " and make Julius Caesar talk like the emasculated Sam Weller of Mr. Cornwall's imagination, and there are no signs of a revolutionary war in the offing. The best that E. H. Smith could do in answer to Mr. Cornwall's invective was to point out that " the mere fact that this [reformed] method has been adopted by the Professors in Oxford and Cambridge, and by a majority of the head masters of public schools in England, and in this country by Harvard and many other colleges, entitles it at least, to consideration and careful attention." [46]

We have seen that the first attempt at reform in England, as a result of the Munro and Palmer Syllabus in 1871, was none too successful. The battle was renewed by the Cambridge Philological Society in 1886, when a committee was appointed to draw up a scheme for the reformed pronunciation. This committee's preliminary report was published in March, 1886, in the *Academy* (29. 170-1),[47] to be issued with some revisions the following year under the title *The Pronunciation of Latin in the Augustan Period* (London). The committee explain their method in a foreword:

> It having been felt by some teachers at Cambridge that the time had come to make a further attempt to correct the errors of the ordinary English pronunciation of Latin, a letter of enquiry was sent out to ascertain the amount of support which such an attempt would receive. This called forth very encouraging answers from lecturers in almost every college in Cambridge and not a few schoolmasters. The following statement was therefore drawn up by a small committee: it has been fully discussed at two meetings of the Society as an approximate statement of the pronunciation of Latin by the educated classes in the Augustan period.

An anonymous writer in the *Saturday Review*,[48] exasperated by the Cambridge manifesto, sums up the situation prior to 1887. He regrets very deeply that such a thing as pronunciation reform was ever started, indeed, seems to be a man who is constitutionally " agin " all change:

[46] " The 'Roman Method' of Pronouncing Latin—Is It a Mistake? " *American Church Review* 31 (1879). 377.

[47] For dissenting opinions see H. J. Roby and R. Ellis, *Academy* 29 (1886). 187, 205.

[48] 64 (Oct. 15, 1887). 513-4.

For a good many years past various systems of the kind have been put forward at headmaster's [*sic*] conferences and similar meetings, but the Universities have hitherto been indocile to change, and as long as they did not move, it was practically impossible for schools to do anything. . . . The Cambridge circular . . . changes the plaything into a " sealed pattern." If Oxford were to follow suit, there can be little doubt that the system would become almost universal—till another rose. . . . Why, then, with nothing (or *Si Peu Que Rien*) to gain, with a great deal to lose, and with no discoverable motive except the desire of innovation, should we cut ourselves off from the traditions of English scholarship, confuse and muddle the whole system of training, and install upon the ruins of the old something which will last—how long?

An American writer in the Syracuse *Academy* ("A Journal of Secondary Education") [49] states that " the advantages of this [reformed] pronunciation are wholly confined to the business of instruction, and even within these limits are not very great." Already, apparently, people had begun to pronounce familiar Latin words and phrases in English context (such as *principia, sine qua non,* etc.) with the new pronunciation, and the writer, quite reasonably I should say, deplores this as " bad form ":

What we here wish to insist upon is that it betrays a lack of respect for the amenities and proprieties of social intercourse,—in short that it is in *bad form*—to speak Latin words or phrases outside the class-room, otherwise than in the traditional English manner. . . . There is a very large class of young persons " graduating " from schools and colleges who are apt to carry with them into social life the conception that the pronunciation they have been taught is the *right pronunciation,* and that they must continue to use it whenever they have occasion to utter a Latin word or phrase just as they would try to speak by the dictionary in their own language or in French or German. . . . Outside the walls [of the class-room] exists a great tradition of Latin pronunciation, to ignore which betrays an abysmal lack of *savoir faire,* a disloyalty to the decencies of life, an unfamiliarity with the code of polite intercourse. *Good form* in Latin pronunciation means pronunciation according to the ancient custom of English and American scholars. This alone is unobtrusive, quiet and gentlemanly.

The editor of *Scribner's Magazine* [50] tells of hearing Terence's *Phormio* in the original Latin given by Harvard students in the

[49] " Good Form in Latin Pronunciation " 4 (1889). 348-50.
[50] 24 (1898). 506-7.

Sanders Theatre in Cambridge. " Of course," he tells us, " the now current ' classical ' pronunciation of Latin was in full blast; and I, whose classical studies date back to the days of the old ' Oxford ' pronunciation, looked forward to a new sensation." He began to feel, however, that something was wrong, and soon saw clearly enough that what he was hearing was no more like the Roman speech of Terence's time (one wonders how he knew so precisely what the speech of Terence's time was like) than an American schoolboy's pronunciation of French is like French. " Realising this, I began also to see that the now current ' classical ' pronunciation of Greek must be in precisely the same evil case: resulting in a gibberish no whit better." He proceeds, with some heat, " Yet these twin jargons pretend to be classically spoken Greek and Latin. *Proh pudor*! One blushes at the effrontery of our universities. . . ." His expectations of the reformed pronunciation seem rather unreasonable, however, for he declares, " It seems to me unquestionable that our university professors have by no means given us the authentic vowel and consonant sounds—let alone the characteristic vocal inflection and accent—of classic Greek and Roman speech, but have only taken certain entirely English (or American) sounds and distributed them afresh over the alphabet, thus giving the alphabet a phonetic interpretation quite new to us." However, if the reformed pronunciation of Latin seems a sorry thing, the introduction of " the so-called ' classical ' pronunciation of Greek appears simply impudent." Greek is not a dead language, the writer declares—amazingly enough, ancient and modern, Greek are " really one and the same." Therefore we can learn Greek from a native; but we cannot do so with Latin. " What best substitute, then, can we find for a Latin *vox viva*? It seems to me that the old, now abandoned ' Oxford ' pronunciation gives us this best substitute. It is admittedly not classical . . . but it is at least English and therefore alive."

Despite occasional opposition, however, in 1901 it was estimated that the reformed pronunciation was in use by more than 96% of the students of Latin in American secondary schools.[51] The most important of the " die-hards " seems to

[51] See J. E. Sandys, *loc. cit.*, p. 461.

have been Professor Charles E. Bennett of Cornell, who was still against the reformed pronunciation in 1917, and presumably until his death in 1921. Professor Bennett was forced to admit that, though the English and continental methods survived in America in 1901, " probably the two together are not represented by five per cent. of the Latin pupils of the secondary schools; in the colleges the percentage must be lower still." [52] He was still saying in 1917, after enumerating the difficulties and disadvantages of the reformed pronunciation:

> The foregoing practical considerations . . . coupled with the practically universal failure to adhere to its principles, have long seemed to my mind valid grounds for its abandonment. . . . Certainly it can no longer be held to be a moral duty to maintain a system of pronunciation which the experience of twenty years has shown to result in miserable failure, and the intrinsic difficulties of whose accurate application are so evident. . . . The foregoing are the considerations which have for years weighed with me, and which have finally compelled me to believe that the retention of our present unmethodical ' method ' of pronouncing Latin has proved itself a serious mistake. . . . Certain educators advocate the employment of the Roman pronunciation on moral grounds, urging that it is our bounden duty to apply what we know to be true. It is equally on moral grounds (among others) that I would urge the immediate abandonment of the Roman pronunciation. . . . The English pronunciation is at least honest. It confessedly violates vowel quantity, thought I doubt whether it actually does so any more than the Roman method as actually employed. . . . The sober conservative sense of German and English educators has thus far resisted . . . this unwise spirit of innovation. In America we are unfortunately too prone to view with favour any new idea, educational or other, and to embark precipitately in experiments which involve serious consequences.[53]

Professor Bennett is quite correct in his remark anent the wariness of English educators. English acceptance of the reformed pronunciation was not so eager as in America, despite the authority of the Cambridge Philological Society. There was so much backsliding that the fight had to be taken up anew by the Modern Languages Association in 1901, by the Classical Association in 1904-5, and by the Philological Societies of Ox-

[52] *The Teaching of Latin and Greek in the Secondary School* (New York, 1906), p. 66.

[53] *Ibid.*, ed. 1917, pp. 76-80.

ford and Cambridge in 1906. The reform was ultimately accepted by the various groups of head masters in December 1906-January 1907, and the proposed scheme formally approved by the Board of Education in February 1907. However, as an anonymous writer in the *Spectator* [54] put it, the matter was still far from settled: " Of the public schools, Eton and Westminster are understood to hold aloof, partially or entirely." Westminster, the writer points out, would no doubt find herself in difficulties as regards the annual Latin play, " which would become unintelligible to old Westminster boys for a generation unless they chose to put themselves to school again." " Sentiment," he tells us, " or, as some people prefer to call it, taste, is in very many cases, perhaps in most, the decisive factor in the refusal of the ' restored ' pronunciation." Everything was to this writer fairly easy to accept save [w] for *v*:

> Read the virile phrase ' vivida vis animi ' to him [the senior classic] in the English way, and then ask him to find anything virile, or rather *wereel,* in *weewida weese animi,* and he will writhe in agony. In truth, to be told that the satisfactory mouthing out of such words as ' vilis,' ' vigor,' ' vindex,' and other vital and vituperative words must give place to the weak wailings of the ' w's ' is a hard saying.

However, to this writer " it is difficult to regard the whole movement . . . as a matter of supreme importance," and it is his belief that " the national clock is not being put very far back every day because a large number of thinking persons still prefer ' v ' to ' w,' and cannot put up with ' weekee ' as the final word of Caesar's message to the Senate."

The English are apparently more tenacious than Americans, for usage is still far from uniform in England, though Henry Bradley could quite correctly state in 1920 that the " traditional system of pronunciation is rapidly becoming obsolete," [55] whereas I should think it perfectly safe to say that the reformers have had a complete victory in America. On the other hand, a committee appointed by the Prime Minister in England in 1921 could only state that the reformed way " has established itself without any difficulty in the Secondary Schools and the

[54] 98 (1907). 526-7.

[55] Introduction to Sargeaunt's *Pronunciation of Engl. Words Derived from the Lat.,* p. 5.

Girls' Schools. It has been officially adopted in most of the Public Schools, but in only a few of them is it consistently and uniformly used." [56] Dissenting voices in this country have been few. S. I. Lex in 1908 thought the Roman method sheer folly, rising to heights of patriotic emotion when he writes, " As lovers of our own country, as lovers of our own language, the richest and best language on the globe we inhabit, let us rise in our intellectual independence, and throw off this foreign yoke, and be no longer ' slaves to a horde of petty tyrants.' " [57] Professor A. W. Anthony's statement in 1909 that there was " no present warrant for a standard pronunciation in present or prospective conversational uses," his question " Why perpetuate longer a custom of less than thirty years' duration, which has naught but a worn-out theory to commend it? " [58] brought forth a storm of protest in the *Nation*.[59] However, as lately as 1927, Professor B. L. Ullman of the University of Chicago expressed his belief that the present emphasis on the correlation of Latin and English vocabulary might suggest to some that the advantages of the English pronunciation are perhaps greater than was realised at the time of the adoption of the reformed method, and referred to " meticulous accuracy . . . an exemplification of that pedantry which is due to our youthfulness in research.[60]

In 1927 the old controversy was revived in England, if, indeed, it can be said ever to have died down. Vernon Rendall points out in the *Saturday Review* [61] that " in *The Times* of late letters have been thick about the pronunciation of Latin, and a leading article [62] has pleaded for the revival of the old

[56] Quoted by Vernon Rendall, " The Pronunciation of Latin," *Saturday Review* 143 (1927). 40.

[57] " The Roman Method," *Journal of Education* 68. 709.

[58] " Pronunciation of the Classics," *Nation* (New York), March 18, 1909, p. 276. Reprinted in *Journal of Education* 69 (1909). 657-8.

[59] See especially the letters of R. K. Hack, W. H. Alexander, C. H. Dickerman, and H. H. Yeames (April 1, 1909, pp. 330-1). Remarks Professor Yeames, with admirable condescension and serene disregard of fact: " It is needless to say that our English cousins, after these centuries of insular absurdity, are now engaged in the process of wholesale reform in the pronunciation of the classical languages, and are fast conforming to the usage of the rest of the world."

[60] " The Teaching of the Pronunciation of Latin," *Classical Journal* 23. 24-32.

[61] " The Pronunciation of Latin " 143. 39.

[62] Occasioned by a Latin play performed at Westminster and a resolution proposed at the Headmasters' Conference at Brighton, to the effect that the reformed pronunciation had failed after trial to justify itself and should be given up. The action was, however, heartily defeated.

system, which our grandchildren may again enjoy, talking Latin as easily as English." J. F. Roxburgh reports in the same year that " Eton has recently announced that it prefers boys to come with the old pronunciation, while most of the other schools ask for the reformed." [63] In 1932, H. K. Baker refers to " a recent pronouncement " by the Head Master of Eton that " he regarded as disastrous the recent [!] change in Latin pronunciation, which put a serious stumbling-block in the way of the average boy." [64]

We may conclude, I think, that in England the triumph of scholarship (or pedantry, as the staunch traditionalists would call it) over tradition has been gradual, and is not yet complete. The clash of the old and the new is well exemplified by Mr. Chips and Mr. Ralston in James Hilton's popular novel, *Goodbye, Mr. Chips* (Boston, 1934). Mr. Ralston accuses Chips of slackness and obstinacy:

" This question of Latin pronunciation, for instance—I think I told you years ago that I wanted the new style used throughout the school. The other masters obeyed me; you prefer to stick to your old methods, and the result is simply chaos and inefficiency."

Chips replies:

" Well, I—umph—I admit that I don't agree with the new pronunciation. I never did. Umph—a lot of nonsense, in my opinion. Making boys say ' Kickero ' at school when—umph—for the rest of their lives they'll say ' Cicero.' . . . And instead of ' vicissim '—God bless my soul—you'd make them say ' We kiss 'im '! " [65]

G. C. Moore Smith, writing in 1930, expresses concern over what the reformed pronunciation of Latin may do to the English language, and reports having heard [prilʌd] for *prelude*, *orgy* and *plagiarism* with [g], *sociological* with [k].[66] To these I

[63] " The Pronunciation of Latin," *Spectator* 138. 796.

[64] *Notes and Queries*, April 2, 1932, p. 248.

[65] Chap. 11. See also John Galsworthy's *Old English*, in which old Sylvanus Heythorp, the representative of the old order, just after remarking to a business associate, " Pronounce Horace like foreigners now, don't they? " is obliged to correct his granddaughter for her " reformed " pronunciation of *lares* and *penates* (3. 1).

[66] " The English Language and the ' Restored ' Pronunciation of Latin," *loc. cit.*, pp. 177-8.

can add from my own notes, taken at the time of hearing or as shortly thereafter as decorum would permit, such completely "Romanised" or hybrid pronunciations as the following:

Aesculapius [ɛskəlapɪəs]
Africanus [æfrɪkanəs] (preceded by Scipio [sɪpɪou])
alma mater [ælmə matər]
Agamemnon [ægəmɛmnoun]
alumnae [əlʌmnaɪ]
alumni[67] [əlʌmnɪ]
a priori [a prɪɔrɪ]
caveat [kawɪat]
credo [kredou]
cum laude [kum laudɪ]
certiorari [sʌrʃərarɪ]
Cleopatra [kliəpatrə]
casus belli [kasəs bɛlli]
contemptus mundi [kəntɛmptəs mundaɪ]
deus ex machina [deəs ɛks mákɪna] and [məkínə] and [məʃínə]
dies irae [daɪiz iraɪ]
data [datə]
fungi [fʌŋgaɪ]
foedera [fɔɪdəra]
Gesta (Romanorum) [gɛstə]
genus [ʤenəs]
hic jacet [hɪk jakɪt]
ignoramus [ɪgnəraməs]
in medias res [ɪn mediəs res]
lucus a non lucendo [ljukəs a noun ljukɛndou]
Meleager[68] [mɛlɪægər]
plus ultra [plʌs ultrə]
Palladis Tamia [pælədɪs tamɪə]
principio [prɪnkɪpɪou]
Phi Beta Kappa[69] [faɪ betə kæpə]
regina[70] [rəginə]
sarcophagi [sarkafəgaɪ]
scaena prima [sinə primə]
sine qua non [sine kwa noun]
status [statəs]
streptococci [strɛptəkaki]
thesaurus [þɪsaurəs]
ultimatum [ʌltɪmatəm]
via [viə]

These pronunciations indicate at least that there is a great deal of hesitation and confusion about the pronunciation of foreign words from Latin in English, a confusion which obviously did not exist before the introduction of the reformed pronunciation. The fact that no dictionary has given its full sanction to the use of the reformed pronunciation in such words and phrases indicates that the dictionaries, in this as in other respects, have not taken account of a definite trend of the times, a trend which

[67] Note that the reformed pronunciation completely reverses the traditional pronunciation of *alumnae* and *alumni*.

[68] Sally B. Kinsolving, *Grey Heather* (Portland, Me., 1930), p. 84, rimes this name with *lagger* and *stagger*.

[69] The pronunciation indicated is official for the fraternity. According to the *Key Reporter* 3 (1938). 8: "Of 276 members in attendance at the 19th Triennial Council in Atlanta in September, 123 expressed preference for Phy Bayta Kappa, 31 for Phy Beeta Kappa, and 11 for Phee Bayta Kappa. None demanded Phee Bayta Kahppa. . . . One ballot was marked 'All d——— [*sic*] foolishness.'"

[70] In the phrase "Victoria Regina." "Victoria" did not, however, begin with [w]!

has gone so far that most educated people, in America at least, look upon the traditional pronunciation of such expressions as uncouth, and would hesitate to use them even with the sanction of the lexicographer; on the other hand, as the examples show, there is much wavering in such words as *genus* [ʤenəs], [ʤinəs], a wavering which is due entirely, I think, to the influence of the reformed pronunciation. The pronunciations I have recorded have naturally all come from the mouths of learned men, usually from men who do not "look up" a word in the dictionary for its pronunciation, but only for its meaning. The fact that such wavering exists between "reformed" and English sounds is surely not without significance: we are witnessing in the making a definite change in the pronunciation of a largish body of words, many of them long a part of the vocabulary of the cultured speaker of English, a change that can hardly be ignored much longer by the lexicographers and the grammarians.[71]

University of Maryland

[71] The most recent edition of *Webster's New International Dictionary* (Springfield, Mass., 1937) recognises the situation, but informs us that the English method is "still used . . . almost exclusively in the pronunciation of Latin scientific words in English context, for Latin legal phrases, and for familiar phrases and quotations from Latin in English context, though with many variations, especially since the English method of pronunciation ceased to be widely taught in the schools," adding that "since most of the Latin words and phrases contained in the Dictionary fall in one or another of these categories, their pronunciation is indicated according to the English method" (p. liv). The Funk and Wagnalls *New Standard Dictionary* (New York, 1925) hedges likewise, pointing out that though popular usage is divided between the old and the new, "it is probable that with the lapse of time the Roman pronunciation will prevail more and more, since modern scholarship is overwhelmingly in its favor"; however, pronunciations are given according to the English method, though the editors explain that their practice by no means indicates that "a preference for that method is thereby expressed" (p. xxviii).

VITA

Thomas Pyles was born in Frederick, Maryland, in 1905. After his graduation in 1922 from the Boys' High School of Frederick, he entered the University of Maryland, from which institution he received the degrees of B. A. and M. A. in 1926 and 1927 respectively. After desultory study in the University of Chicago and the University of Cambridge, he entered the Johns Hopkins University in 1935. He was admitted to the degree of Ph. D. in 1938, and in the same year was made a member of the Phi Beta Kappa Society. Since 1927 he has been a member of the Department of English in the University of Maryland.